

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present patent application based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-5 and 7-8 and the specification are amended, and claims 1 and 2 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The claims have been amended to remove the parenthetical references to features described in the specification and to clarify their intended meanings. This is intended not only to place the claims in proper U.S. format but also to broaden the scope of the claims accordingly. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 3-5 and 7-8 will remain pending in the patent application.

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In connection with the objection, the Examiner indicated that "the text of the specification is not clear." Applicants disagree and note that the Office Action has not identified portion(s) of the specification that is/are unclear. However, in an abundance of caution, Applicants have reviewed the specification and corrected minor clerical mistakes.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2 and 6 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus rendering moot the rejection of these claims.

In connection with the rejection, the Examiner indicated that "the claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice." In response, claims 1, 3-5 and 7-8 are amended to clarify their language and to conform with U.S. current practice. For example, the recitation "assign a call" has been deleted in claim 1.

The Examiner also indicated that the term "ordre public" is not known and that no clarification is provided in the reference. Applicants respectfully disagree and note that "ordre public" is a well known term that expresses a people's concept of morality, decency and justice, as evidenced by Exhibit 1 attached herewith. Applicants also note that a similar definition is provided in the background section of the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand the meaning of the terms used in claims 1, 3-5 and 7-8 and, therefore, would readily ascertain the scope of the claim. It is also noted that *per* MPEP 2173.02, “[T]he examiner’s focus during examination of claims for compliance with the requirement for definiteness of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is whether the claim meets the threshold requirements of clarity and precision, not whether more suitable language or modes of expression are available.” It is respectfully submitted that amended claims 1, 3-5 and 7-8 are precise, clear, correct and unambiguous and, therefore, fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on Gardos *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,880,007) (hereinafter “Gardos”) in view of Peled *et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0016831) (hereinafter “Peled”) and Sheth *et al.* (U.S. 6,874,030) (hereinafter “Sheth”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites an arrangement for blocking unwanted network traffic in open data and telecommunication networks, comprising, *inter alia*, a first level of blocking unwanted communications that contravene ordre public, the first level of blocking being in the form of a top level domain requiring registration for websites residing within the top level domain; a second level of blocking providing micro debiting through a debiting server during connection to the top level domain, the second level of blocking including means for debiting of the top level domain via micro debiting and means for accumulating said micro debiting during every session a user is connected to said domain; and a switch for use with the second level of blocking, the switch being adapted to be turned on and off based on debit-free time periods. It is respectfully submitted that Gardos fails to disclose, teach or suggest an arrangement including these features.

Gardos discloses a method of administering a plurality of modifiable domain name records in a database in cooperation with a DNS root server that allows registrants and designated agents of registrants to update records associated with multiple domain names.

However, unlike claim 1, Gardos is silent as to a first level of blocking unwanted communications that contravene ordre public. In addition, Gardos is silent as to a means for debiting the top level domain via micro debiting and means for accumulating the micro debiting during every session a user is connected to the domain. Furthermore, Gardos makes no mention of a switch as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner alleged that it is unclear as to what is meant by micro-debiting but contended, nonetheless, that such features are disclosed by Gardos. Applicants respectfully disagree and note that micro-debiting is a well known method of paying small amounts of money during a period of time. In the present case, micro-debiting is used during connection of the computer to the top level domain. Gardos does not disclose, teach or suggest these features. Unlike claim 1, Gardos merely shows in FIG. 7 a screen that is accessed by the user during registration of a domain name.

Peled and Sheth fail to remedy the deficiencies of Gardos. Peled merely relates to electronic shopping and discloses a method of extracting the geographical and/or virtual location of an internet user, requesting for example goods or services. (See paragraph [0019]). Sheth discloses a method of controlling subscriber access in a network capable of establishing connections with multiple services. (See col. 4, lines 19-40). However, neither Peled nor Sheth disclose, teach or suggest the features recited by claim 1. As such, any reasonable combination of Gardos, Peled and Sheth cannot result, in any way, in the invention of claim 1.

Claims 3 and 4 are patentable over Gardos, Peled and Sheth, and a combination thereof, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 5 is patentable over Gardos, Peled and Sheth, and a combination thereof, for at least similar reasons as provided above in claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein. Namely, claim 5 is patentable over Gardos, Peled and Sheth at least because this claim recites a method of blocking unwanted network traffic in open data and telecommunication networks, comprising, *inter alia*, providing a first level of blocking unwanted communications with respect to ordre public in the form of a top level domain requiring registration for websites residing within the domain; providing a second level of blocking by (a) micro debiting the top level domain and (b) accumulating said micro debiting during every session a user is connected to said domain through a debiting server; and executing micro debiting based on debit-free time periods. For similar reasons discussed previously, Applicants respectfully submit that Gardos, Peled and Sheth, and a combination thereof, do not disclose, teach or suggest these features.

Claims 7 and 8 are patentable over Gardos, Peled and Sheth, and a combination thereof, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 5 and for the additional features recited therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on Gardos in view of Peled and Sheth are respectfully requested.

The rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP



CHRISTOPHE F. LAIR
Reg. No. 54248
Tel. No. 703.770.7797
Fax No. 703.770.7901

JDK/CFL/smm
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900

Enclosure: Exhibit 1